REMARKS

The Examiner found that claims 4, 14, and 24 would be allowed if rewritten in independent for to include the limitations of the base and intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claims 4, 14, and 24 in independent form including the requirements of the base and intervening claims to place in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15-23, and 25-30 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Szurkowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,933). Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 recite a method, system, and signal bearing medium for processing a message in a network computing system including a facsimile transmission comprised of a recipient contact address and message content, wherein the message content includes at least one of message text and attached files. These claims require: managing the facsimile transmission as a fax job in a first computing system; transferring the message content to a second computing system; launching, with the second computing system, at least one application program to convert the message content to at least one image in a file format; transferring, with the second computing system, the converted message content in the file format to the first computing system; and transferring, with the first computing system, the message content in the file format to a communication port for transmittal to the recipient contact address.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 require that a first computing system manage a facsimile transmission and transfer the message content from the facsimile transmission to a second computing system, where the second computing system launches at least one application to convert the message content to an image in a file format. The Examiner cited FIG. 1 and col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 19 as teaching the above claim requirements. (Office Action, pg. 3) In particular, the Examiner likened the teleconference server 103 to the first computing system and the administrative server 110 in FIG. 1 of Szurkowski as disclosing the second computing system.

Applicant traverses because the components the Examiner sites to as teaching the claimed first and second computer system are just components within the single teleconferencing server 103 of Szurkowski, not separate computer systems as claimed.

For instance, the Examiner cites to the Administrative processor 110 in FIG. 1 as the second computer system that receives the message content for a fax job and launches an application to convert the message content to an image. (Office Action, pg. 3) The cited cols. 2-4 of Szurkowski mention that the administrative processor 110 informs a voice bridge of teleconference schedules and creates an attendance table for each teleconference. Other functions of the administrative processor 110 include handling billing, running reports, and performing diagnostics in the server 103. (Szurkowski, col. 3, line 13-col. 4, line 4) Nowhere do the cited cols. 2-4 anywhere disclose that the administrative processor 110, which the Examiner likens to the claimed second computing system, perform the claimed operations of receiving message content from a first computing system and launching at least one application to convert the message content for a fax job.

The Examiner cited col. 4, lines 21-25 as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the message content to at least one image in a file format and transferring, with the second computing system, the converted message content in the file format to the first computing system. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicant traverses.

The cited col. 4 mentions that an email processor 139 processes files from an email message and feeds the files to a software application to convert their content to facsimile pages. Although the cited col. 4 mentions how to convert email content to facsimile pages, nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that the email program return the converted message content to a different computing system that transfers the message content to a communication port for transmittal. Instead, Szurkowski mentions that the cited email processor 139 stores the converted pages in a facsimile bridge 150, where the facsimile bridge 150 transmits the fax. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 30-40 and FIG. 1). Thus, the cited email processor 139 does not transfer the message content to a different first computing system as claimed because the email processor 139 and facsimile bridge 150 are in the same computing system, teleconferencing server 103, not first and second separate computing systems as claimed.

Further, the claims require that the first computing system that manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the fax to a communication port transmit the second computing

system the message content to convert. The Examiner cited the teleconferencing server 103 as the first computing system. However, the cited email processor 103 receives the email content from an email network 161 (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 21-25), and not from a separate first computing system that manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the converted message content to communication port for transmittal as claimed. In other words, the cited email network 161 does not manage the facsimile transmission and transfer the message to a communication port as claimed. Thus, the cited email processor 139 does not disclose the claimed second computing system that launches applications to convert the message content because the cited email processor 139 does not perform the claimed operations of receiving the message content from a first computing system that also manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the converted message content.

The Examiner cited col. 4, line 56 to col. 6, line 53 and col. 8, lines 9-65 as disclosing the operation of transferring, with the first computing system, the message content to a communication port. (Office Action, pg. 3) The cited cols. 4-6 discuss the facsimile bridge 150 in the server 103 that transmits fax jobs converted by the email processor 139. However, the claims also require that the first computing system that transmits the fax job also manage the facsimile transmission as a first job and transfer the message content to the second computing system to convert the message content. The cited facsimile bridge 150 that transmits the fax does not perform the claim operations performed by the first computing system of managing the facsimile transmission as a fax job and transferring message content to the second computing system that converts the content. Instead, the cited email processor 103 receives the message content from an email network, which is not the same first computing system that manages the facsimile transmission and that receives the converted message content converted by the email processor.

Thus, the cited Szurkowski fails to disclose all the claim requirements because the cited Szurkowski has a single computing system, i.e., server 103, that performs all fax management and conversion operations. Independent claims 1, 11, and 21, on the other hand, divide these operations between separate first and second computing systems. The cited Szurkowski nowhere

discloses that the management and transmission of a fax job is performed by a first computing system and that a second computing system launches at least one application program to convert the message content to at least one image that is then transferred back to the first computing system to transfer to a communication port. If the Examiner maintains the rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific components from the cited Szurkowski that perform the claimed operations of the first and second computing systems.

Accordingly, claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentable over the cited Szurkowski because the cited Szurkowski does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 22, 23, 25-30 are patentable over the cited Szurkowski because they depend from one of claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited Szurkowski for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, certain of the dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require transferring, with the first computing system, a job number assigned to the fax job to the second computing system and requesting, with the second computing system, the message content for the job number, wherein the first computing system transfers the message content in response to receiving the request from the second computing system. The Examiner cited col. 5, line 16 to col. 7, line 52 as disclosing the requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicant traverses.

The Examiner cited the email processor 139 as performing the operations of the second computing system that converts the message content. The cited Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 receives messages having fax content from an email network 161. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 21-24). Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose or mention that the email processor receive a job number assigned to a fax from the first computing system that also manages the fax job. Instead, the email processor 139 in the cited Szurkowski that converts the message content receives the message from an email network 161.

Further, nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose the claim requirement of requesting, with the second computing system, the message content for the job number. Again,

the Examiner cited the email processor 139 of Szurkowski as performing the operations of the first computing system. However, the cited Szurkowski only mentions that the email processor receives messages to fax from an email network 161. Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that the cited email processor 139 use a job number received from the same first computing system that manages fax jobs to request the message content. Instead, in the cited Szurkowski, the email processor 139 just receives the message content from an email network 161.

The cited cols. 5-7 also nowhere disclose the above claim requirements. The cited cols. 5-7 discuss how a teleconference is managed and how the facsimile bridge 150 is used to fax materials to the teleconference attendees. Nowhere do these cited cols. 5-7 anywhere disclose the claim requirements concerning how a first computing system that manages fax jobs transmits a job number to the second computing system that launches applications to convert message content that the second computing system requests using the job number. If the Examiner maintains the rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific components from the cited Szurkowski that perform the claimed operations of the first and second computing systems.

Accordingly, claims 2, 12, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 3, 13, and 23 depend from claims 2, 12, and 22 and further require maintaining, with the first computing system, a job table including fax job records identified by job number and changing, with first computing system, state fields in the fax job records to manage the workflow of the fax jobs between the first computing system, second computing systems, and communication port. The Examiner cited FIG. 2 and col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 of Szurkowski as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pgs. 3-4)

The cited Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 converts the message to fax pages. Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that a first computing system, separate from the email processor 139 (that the Examiner likens to the computing system) maintains a job table including job table records and changes states in such records to manage the

workflow of fax jobs between the first and second computer systems. Instead, the cited Szurkowski only mentions that the email processor 139 perform conversion operations, and nowhere discloses a different computing system as managing fax jobs with a job table that are converted by the email processor 139.

The cited col. 5 discusses how the teleconferencing server 103 manages faxes sent among attendees of a teleconference. However, nowhere does the cited col. 5 anywhere disclose that a first computing system maintain a job table having information on fax jobs to convert and transmit and that a second computing system convert message content to fax pages as claimed. If the Examiner maintains the rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific components from the cited Szurkowski that perform the claimed operations of the first and second computing systems.

Accordingly, claims 3, 13, and 23 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require that for each attachment file received from the first computing system, the second computing system further performs determining one of multiple application programs capable of opening the attachment file and using the determined application program to convert the content of the attachment file to one or more images in the file format, wherein all the images in the file format comprising the at least one converted attachment file are transferred to the first computing system. The Examiner cited col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 and col. 8, lines 9-65 of Szurkowski as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office action, pg. 4) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

The cited col. 4 of Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 feeds files from a message to a software application to convert the content to facsimile pages. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 30-35. Nowhere does the cited col. 4 anywhere disclose determining one of multiple applications capable of opening the attachment and then using the determined application to convert the attachment. The cited col. 4 only mentions that "a software application" is fed the

files to convert, and nowhere discloses the claim requirement of determining one of multiple application programs to convert the attachment file.

The cited col. 8 discusses how a facsimile may be transmitted to a teleconference attendee. Nowhere does the cited col. 8 anywhere disclose or mention the claim requirement of determining one of multiple application programs to convert the attachment file.

If the Examiner maintains the rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific component of the cited Szurkowski that determines one of multiple applications to use to convert an attachment for each attachment for a fax.

Accordingly, claims 6, 16, and 26 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend from claims 6, 16 and 26 and further require maintaining, with the second computing system, multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format. The Examiner cited col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 and col. 7, line 7 to col. 8, line 65 as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

As discussed, the cited email processor 139 that converts message to fax pages nowhere discloses using multiple applications or maintaining multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content for different attachments. Instead, the cited email processor 139 just mentions feeding files to a software application to convert. (Szurkowski, col. 5, lines 21-40)

The cited cols. 7 and 8 discusses handling of faxes during a teleconferencing call, and how to transmit facsimiles transmitted as part of a teleconferencing call to attendees of the teleconference. Nowhere do the cited cols. 7 and 8 anywhere disclose that any component, including the email processor 139, maintain multiple application programs open to concurrently convert content for different attachments.

If the Examiner maintains the rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific component of the cited Szurkowski that maintain multiple application programs open to concurrently convert content for different attachments.

Accordingly, claims 8, 18, and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend from claims 8, 18, and 28 and further require that the different attachment files concurrently converted to images in the file format are part of different fax jobs. Because the cited Szurkowski nowhere discloses multiple applications, the cited Szurkowski likewise nowhere discloses the additional requirements of claims 9, 19, and 29 that the concurrently converted attachment files are part of different fax jobs.

Accordingly, claims 9, 19, and 29 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-30 are patentable over the art of record. Applicant submits herewith the claim fee. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: <u>March 11, 2003</u>   By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

<u>Please direct all correspondences to</u>:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984